KBHKYOUN 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 18 CR 262 (VEC) 4 V. 5 FABIO SIMON YOUNES ARBOLEDA, 6 Defendant. -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. November 17, 2020 9 12:40 p.m. Before: 10 11 HON. VALERIE E. CAPRONI, 12 District Judge 13 APPEARANCES 14 15 AUDREY STRAUSS, Acting United States Attorney for the 16 Southern District of New York KYLE WIRSHBA 17 Assistant United States Attorney 18 DONALD YANNELLA Attorney for Defendant 19 20 ALSO PRESENT: LISA CHAN, Pretrial Services 21 22 23 24 25

1 (Case called)

MR. WIRSHBA: Good afternoon, your Honor. Kyle Wirshba, on behalf of the government.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. YANNELLA: And for Mr. Younes, Donald Yannella. Good to see you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Yannella. Good to see you.

Good afternoon, Mr. Younes.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

This is the first appearance of this defendant in this case before me, so the new Rule 5(f) requires me to warn the prosecutor of his Brady obligations.

So as I am required to do, I remind the government of its obligations under *Brady v. Maryland* and its progeny to disclose to the defense all information, whether admissible or not, that is favorable to the defendant, material either for guilt or punishment, and known to the government. The government must make good-faith efforts to disclose such information to the defense as soon as reasonably possible after its existence becomes known to the government.

As part of these obligations, the government must disclose information that can be used to impeach the trial testimony of a government witness within the meaning of *Giglio*

v. United States and its progeny, and must do so sufficiently in advance of trial in order for the defendant to make effective use of it at trial.

I remind you that these obligations are continuing, and they apply regardless of whether you credit the information.

For these purposes, the government includes any federal, state, and local prosecutors, law enforcement officers, and other officials who have participated in the investigation of the events underlying the charges in this case. It applies to anyone who has participated in the prosecution of the charged offenses, whether such officials are still part of the prosecution team or not, and that you have an affirmative obligation to seek from those sources all information that is subject to disclosure.

Finally, I caution the government that if it fails to comply with this order, any number of consequences may follow. I may order production of the information and specify the terms and conditions of such production, or grant a continuance, or impose evidentiary sanctions, or sanction any lawyer responsible for the noncompliance, or dismiss charges before trial, or vacate a conviction after trial or guilty plea, or any other such order that is just under the circumstances.

Mr. Wirshba, do you understand these obligations and confirm that you have fulfilled or will fulfill them?

1	MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor. We understand the
2	obligations, we have and will fulfill them, and we take them
3	extraordinarily seriously.
4	THE COURT: Terrific.
5	Consistent with Rule 5(f), I have previously entered a
6	written order in this case confirming the government's Brady
7	obligations.
8	So the next step is to arraign Mr. Younes.
9	Mr. Younes, have you seen a copy of the indictment in
10	this case, which is numbered 18 CR 262?
11	THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Yes.
12	THE COURT: Has someone read the indictment to you?
13	THE DEFENDANT: When I came to this country?
14	THE COURT: Yes.
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Can you read English?
17	THE DEFENDANT: My English is broken. I speak a
18	little English.
19	THE COURT: Do you read English?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21	THE COURT: Okay. Has someone read the indictment to
22	you?
23	MR. YANNELLA: Judge, may I make a record?
24	THE COURT: Sure.
25	MR. YANNELLA: I wasn't

THE COURT: Do you want to pull the mic closer to you?

MR. YANNELLA: Oh, yes. I had moved it when we were talking earlier.

I wasn't the CJA attorney at presentment; I was substituted in because that attorney was leaving the panel.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YANNELLA: So I have not formally reviewed the indictment with my client, although I did discuss with him the nature of the charges. I think that the former CJA attorney, at presentment, discussed the indictment with Mr. Younes, and he came here on extradition proceedings from Colombia, but I just want to make a record that I haven't done what I would normally do in a case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YANNELLA: I assumed he got arraigned when he got presented, but, apparently, that is not the case. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: I'm not sure if he has been arraigned, but I'm going to arraign -- I see my clerk shaking her head, so I think the answer is no.

Mr. Younes, you're charged in three counts. You're charged with conspiracy to import cocaine into the United States, and you're charged with two separate counts of attempting to import cocaine into the United States.

Do you waive a public reading of the indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: (In English) Yes.

THE COURT: How do you plead, guilty or not guilty? 1 MR. YANNELLA: Not quilty. 2 3 THE DEFENDANT: Not quilty. THE COURT: Mr. Wirshba, where are we on discovery in 4 5 this matter? MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, the government has produced 6 7 discovery to other defendants in this matter, and so already has much of it prepared. The government would request two 8 9 weeks to produce discovery in this matter. There are certain items of individual discovery that the government is 10 11 collecting. I have spoken with defense counsel, and we believe we will be able to make that production within two weeks. 12 13 of the data that needs to be produced may be housed in Miami, 14 and so we will work to get that expeditiously. That's where 15 the agents are in this case. If it is the case that the government requires 16 17 additional time than those two weeks, I'll speak with defense counsel, and we'll, of course, make an application to the 18 Court. 19 20 THE COURT: Great. So discovery is due within two 21 weeks. 22 What's the story on the defendant, 23 Mr. Hernandez-Solarte, is he pending extradition? MR. WIRSHBA: He is not pending extradition, your 24 25 Honor. He is at large, potentially in Colombia, potentially in

Venezuela.

THE COURT: Okay. Because he's at large, the Speedy Trial Clock is not yet running.

MR. WIRSHBA: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm assuming the government is still endeavoring to find Mr. Hernandez?

MR. WIRSHBA: We most certainly are, your Honor. He's indicted in several cases.

THE COURT: Okay.

So what I've got scheduled in this case is a status conference for December the 4th, at 2:00 o'clock. So we'll proceed with that status conference. That was previously scheduled with the codefendant, Mr. Gomez, I believe. So we'll proceed with that on December the 4th, at 2:00 o'clock. That will likely be a telephone conference; in fact, it will most assuredly be a telephone conference.

Mr. Yannella, you're going to need to talk to your client and see if he will waive his personal appearance for that status conference. If he doesn't want to waive appearance, I'm happy to bring him in. I think he's up at Westchester, so that won't trigger a quarantine for him, depending on what's happening in the world of COVID at that point. But my plan is to do a telephone conference if he's amenable to not being present.

MR. YANNELLA: Judge, I will review that with him

prior to December 4th and advise the Court.

THE COURT: Perfect. Okay.

Mr. Yannella, I understand that you want to make a bail application?

MR. YANNELLA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You have the floor.

MR. YANNELLA: Okay.

Your Honor, I understand that it's a presumption case, but I would respectfully submit that, given the unusual circumstances of this case, the defense can overcome the presumption.

First of all, he's 71 years old. He primarily speaks Spanish, although he speaks broken English.

If he were to be released, I would propose that he be permitted to live in Orlando, Florida, with one of his two daughters who live in the United States. I have provided information about the two daughters, who are also two potential cosigners, to the U.S. Attorney's Office last Friday. One of the daughters earns \$55,000 per year, and she works at a company called Ventsu, V-e-n-t-s-u, and the other daughter earns \$45,000 per year, and she works at a company called Mastec, M-a-s-t-e-c. If he were to be released, my client would propose to live with the second of the two daughters, the one who works at Mastec, M-a-s-t-e-c. That daughter's name is Kathryn Younes, that's Kathryn K-a-t-h-r-y-n. She owns her own

home in Florida. She's married. She and her husband are willing to have Ms. Younes' father come live with them during the pendency of the case. They have approximately \$120,000 equity in their home.

The other daughter does not own a home, but she's the one who earns slightly more money. Her name is Paola, P-a-o-l-a, Younes. She's the one who earns \$55,000 a year at Ventsu. So what I'm proposing is that he be released on the signature of those two cosigners, and that he be permitted to live, perhaps in home detention, at Kathryn Younes' home in Orlando, Florida.

This appears to be a somewhat complicated case. I haven't received discovery yet, but I have read the press release from the U.S. Attorney's Office from two years ago. It involves FARC, it involves narcotic trafficking. My client is an individual who has no prior record, either in the United States or in Colombia. He's 71 years old. He worked not as a licensed attorney in Colombia, but he worked in some capacity doing legal work in Colombia. I don't know how it translates exactly because I'm not familiar with the bar requirements down there, but he worked in some capacity in Colombia.

There is a lot to discuss here. He's an individual with health problems. As indicated in the pretrial services report, he has some kind of blockage involving his heart and involving an artery. If he were to get COVID-19, it's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

potentially catastrophic for him, if not fatal.

Another issue that I would like to raise is that if he were to be at the Westchester County Jail, it's going to be exceedingly difficult for me to review discovery with him. And let me explain the difference between the MCC and MDC as opposed to the Westchester County Jail.

I've been trying very hard in the past week, since I picked up two Spanish-speaking clients who had both been extradited from Colombia, and both are housed at the Westchester County Jail. I found out that they have a videoconferencing system, which is apparently the best way for attorneys to consult with their clients, and that's because it's confidential. When you log onto it, it tells you, this is for attorney-client conversations, it is not being recorded. The problem with that is that you're not allowed to add a third party to it. So what I had wanted to do was have a Spanish interpreter somehow added to it, but I've been unable to do that in the past four or five days. Electronically or technologically, they just don't have the capacity to add the third person, and because my client is a Spanish-speaker and speaks only broken English, what I would need to do, based upon my conversations with other CJA attorneys who have Spanish-speaking clients current in the Westchester County Jail, would be to do the videoconference, get an interpreter on my mobile phone, and then hold the mobile phone up to my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

computer, so that the interpreter could translate. I'm told the quality is very poor.

I did do three or four videoconferences in the past week with my clients who are up there. There's very little privacy at their end. In one instance, I had an interpreter -no, not an interpreter, an inmate in the background who could hear what was going on, and he came over and offered to translate, and, of course, I refused to allow that to happen. In another instance - I can't remember if it was the same client - the inmates in the background were suggesting questions for the inmate to ask me as a lawyer. So the confidentiality -- and this is the good option. The only other option -- and I have communicated directly with the staff at the Westchester County Jail just to make sure I'm getting this all right, I really tried very hard. The other option is to do a collect phone call, which I don't mind doing a collect phone call, but they're telling me it's only privileged if it goes to my office, I can't use my mobile phone. Now, the phone call would be ideal because I could get a Spanish interpreter on the phone, do a three-way call, if I had some assurance that it was privileged. Although I don't want to do that, I would do it in these circumstances. That's how I would communicate with him. But, essentially, I have to come to my office in Manhattan in order to do that option, and I haven't been typically doing that, and I probably won't in the months coming up. I will if

I have to, but it really involves travel into Manhattan in order to get a privileged call from my client.

So those are the two options. I don't know if the Court has any influence over the Westchester County Jail. I have raised this with Bobbi Sternheim, who communicates with the courts regarding issues like this, and I've asked them to raise this at the next meeting, but that's where we stand.

So the bottom line is, he's 71 years old, he has health problems, we're probably not headed for a trial anytime soon, because I have murder cases in this district with detained clients, and I was in court yesterday, or virtually in court yesterday, being told that I'm probably not getting a trial date anytime soon. He's going to be detained for a long time, most likely pending trial. This is much more difficult than the average case as far as trial preparation, as far as I can tell, although, of course, I'll learn more. There's every indication that he has a safe and secure place to live. His daughters will make sure he comes back to court. Your Honor can use her discretion in determining the amount of the bond or whether any security is necessary, but he's willing to consent to home detention or even home incarceration in Florida.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Yannella.

Mr. Wirshba?

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, the government believes that

detention is appropriate in this case. As Mr. Yannella acknowledged, this is a presumption case. And, here, we have a defendant who, in the government's view, is both a risk of flight and a danger to the community.

I'll start with danger to the community. Your Honor is aware of the facts of this case, as this is not the first defendant to come before the Court.

THE COURT: No, but refresh my recollection about what the actual evidence against Mr. Younes is.

MR. WIRSHBA: Yes, your Honor, of course.

The evidence against Mr. Younes will show at trial that he participated in a series of meetings in which he agreed with others to provide thousands of kilograms of cocaine, sourced from the FARC, to an individual who claimed to be representing the head of the Sinaloa Cartel.

As your Honor is aware, the FARC is a designated terrorist organization, designated by the State Department, and the individual with whom the defendant and others claimed to be coordinating on behalf of the FARC is one of the codefendants, who is Hernandez-Solarte, who's better known as Jesus Santrich.

THE COURT: And your information is that Hernandez is, in fact, a member of the FARC?

MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, Mr. Hernandez-Solarte was a leader of the FARC before there was a peace accord between the FARC and the Colombian government. He wasn't on the highest

governing body of the FARC; he was on the second highest governing body. He participated in the negotiations with the Colombian government. Ultimately, he was to be named a senator in Colombia, but when this case came to light, he, as others had in the FARC, who had already demobilized from the FARC, chose to run, and he is currently at large, being sought by both Colombian and U.S. authorities.

And I will mention, your Honor, that that individual has also been named in another indictment, charging Nicolás Maduro and others in the Venezuelan regime, of coordinating with the FARC and transporting hundreds of thousands of kilograms of cocaine.

THE COURT: I guess what I was trying to confirm was, during the course of the meetings where they were -- where Mr. Younes thought that he was brokering a cocaine transaction between the FARC and the Sinaloa Cartel, the person he was dealing with as the FARC representative was Mr. Hernandez, who the government has reason to believe was, in fact, a member of the FARC, as opposed to someone who was holding himself out as FARC, but wasn't in fact?

MR. WIRSHBA: I see, your Honor. Yes, that is absolutely correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. WIRSHBA: And, your Honor, the defendant participated in meetings in which thousands of kilograms of

cocaine was discussed, and, ultimately, the defendant participated in a meeting in which a sample of that cocaine, five kilograms of cocaine, was provided to the purported representatives of the Sinaloa Cartel, not the actual representatives who were working on behalf of the government.

So, your Honor, this is extraordinarily serious conduct as reflected in the charges. The evidence here is exceptionally strong. This was a case in which the government was using confidential sources and, therefore, was recording many of these meetings, and so the evidence will show the defendant participated in these meetings, and the jury will get to hear his words as he participated and as he agreed to conduct these transactions.

So, in a way, your Honor, the case is somewhat complicated in that it touches on some interesting international issues, but, in many ways, this case is simple—it is a narcotics case in which the defendant agreed on tape to send thousands of kilograms of cocaine to the United States, and in doing so, violated the narcotics laws. So the defendant is certainly a danger to the community.

With respect to risk of flight, your Honor, I believe that that is really the basis that the government would emphasize most to the Court. The basis for that is that the defendant is not a citizen of the United States. Indeed, he was not even a resident of the United States. The defendant

was living in this country and left this country in 1991 to go back to Bogotá, as reflected in the pretrial services report.

And, your Honor, it appears that at that same time, the defendant, in 1991, was arrested for driving without a license, I believe, and never showed up to court for that citation, and that's on page 3 of the report. And, instead, he left and went to Bogotá, where he then lived until he was extradited just recently.

Your Honor, because he was extradited and was living in Colombia up until his time coming back to this district, it's the government's belief that there is an exceptionally strong reason to believe that the defendant will do what he can to depart this country and leave these charges unanswered in this district. The reason for that is that the defendant has no reason to stay here. If he were to ultimately be convicted, he's facing the ten-year mandatory minimum sentence in this case, and then he's facing deportation back to Colombia, where he is a citizen.

So if the defendant stays to answer the charges here, he would be doing so only to face a ten-year sentence and end up in the same place he would be if he were to flee, which was Colombia. It's the government's submission that there are no ties to this community, the one in the Southern District of New York, and while he does have family residing in Florida, he will not be able to spend time with that family, whether he

goes to jail first and then has to end up back in Colombia or whether he simply flees to Colombia from the Middle District of Florida.

And, your Honor, because it is a presumption case, because the government believes the defendant is a danger to the community and a risk of flight, we would submit that detention is appropriate.

THE COURT: Mr. Yannella?

MR. YANNELLA: Judge, I would just point out that the narrative given by the prosecutor doesn't say a whole lot more than what is in the indictment, and that is that he --

THE COURT: Well, I disagree. In terms of the strength of the case, there is a strong case because the defendant is on tape negotiating huge kilograms — that's the government's case, I have to accept their proffer — negotiating multi-thousands of kilograms of transactions of cocaine from Colombia to the United States.

MR. YANNELLA: But without one example of what he supposedly said. So we already knew coming in here, from the indictment and the press release, that he was present at meetings, and he supposedly agreed to import narcotics into the United States, but in these types of cases involving law enforcement and drug cartels in South America — and I have been involved in these cases before — sometimes narcotics transactions are discussed because there often is corruption

either in law enforcement, or in the military, or among the politicians, but that doesn't mean that every individual at the meeting actually agreed to what was being said.

So we're being told that he attended the meeting, but we don't know how many people were present at the meeting.

We're being told that he agreed or he negotiated, but we're not being told what he said. So what I'm saying is that it doesn't add a lot more. There are often potentially issues of entrapment in cases like this, there are issues about whether everyone who's present at the meeting really knowingly and intentionally joined the conspiracy.

(Pause)

THE COURT: That may be, Mr. Yannella, but you're not in a position at this point to proffer whether that's the case in this particular case, right?

MR. YANNELLA: That's correct.

THE COURT: So what I've got is it's a presumption case. Based on the government's proffer, it is a strong case. We've got someone who is not a citizen and who's associated with an organization that has more than the capacity to make good on the bail if he were to jump bail.

MR. YANNELLA: But he'd be ruining the financial life of his two daughters.

THE COURT: But he could make that up. I mean, he's only ruining it to the extent that he doesn't pay whatever

they've committed to pay. And someone who's brokering thousands of kilos of cocaine has the capability of doing that. All of his ties are in Colombia other than his daughters. His brothers and sisters, his wife, right, everybody's in Colombia except these two children?

MR. YANNELLA: Yes, the pretrial --

THE COURT: In '91, facing really minor charges, unless there was something else going on that he was concerned was going to come out by virtue of his being arrested for driving without a license, he gave up permanent residence to return to Colombia, which is --

MR. YANNELLA: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- which is unusual.

MR. YANNELLA: Well, not necessarily. Some people are from Colombia, and they embrace being from Colombia, and they want to live there because their parents and other family members are there.

THE COURT: Of course, but they don't usually go to the trouble of getting a green card. That's my only point. In my experience, it is unusual for someone, having jumped through every hoop you've got to jump through to get a green card, to give it up based on nothing that I can see other than a minor arrest.

MR. YANNELLA: Okay, I understand your point now.

THE COURT: That's my only point.

So, Mr. Yannella, I'm going to reject your motion for bond without prejudice to re-up it if some of the things that you've suggested, upon review of the evidence, you can proffer; that is, yes, they have tapes, but my guy is sitting in the corner saying nothing, or whatever, but for now, I don't think you've overcome the presumption, which is, this man is a foreign national, looking at a lot of time with very serious charges, and limited ties to the U.S., and to the extent he does have ties, based on the organization that he's associated with, he could make good on any financial loss that he would cause to his suretors. So those are my concerns. But, again, this is without prejudice after you've actually had a chance to look at the evidence.

As for all of the difficulties in consulting with your client in Westchester, I guess what I'll ask you to do is this: Continue to try to work through the problems, including with the legal staff up in Westchester. I confess that without having heard from them, it strikes me as peculiar that they're unwilling to allow a telephone connection to an interpreter when you're having a videoconference, because that would certainly facilitate things. If you ultimately cannot work out a workable solution with Westchester, let me know, and I will direct that your client be moved from Westchester to either MCC or MDC --

MR. YANNELLA: Thank you.

25

1	THE COURT: where things are obviously easier, but			
2	they have there are a whole other set of downsides to MCC			
3	and MDC.			
4	MR. YANNELLA: It seems to me a reasonable solution			
5	would be to allow me to have a privileged phone call from my			
6	mobile phone, and then I could bring the interpreter in			
7	THE COURT: Three-way them in?			
8	MR. YANNELLA: Three-way the interpreter in, and we			
9	could discuss the case.			
10	THE COURT: See what you can do in working through			
11	these problems with Westchester. That's a new one to me. I			
12	had not heard that they're not allowing privileged calls othe:			
13	than to a landline and an office.			
14	MR. YANNELLA: Yes, I got that in an email from the			
15	staff, but I will follow up by myself.			
16	THE COURT: Okay.			
17	Anything further from the government?			
18	MR. WIRSHBA: Your Honor, I believe time is already			
19	excluded to December 4th.			
20	THE COURT: It's not even running. You've got a			
21	fugitive.			
22	MR. WIRSHBA: I'm sorry, yes, your Honor, right.			
23	Which you covered at the beginning, yes, your Honor.			

MR. YANNELLA: Could I just speak briefly with my

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Yannella?

			22	
	KBHKYOUN			
1	client when the court appearance is done?			
2		THE COURT: Yes.		
3		Could you leave him in the courtroom for just a		
4	second?			
5		Yes.		
6		MR. YANNELLA: Thank you.		
7		THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.		
8		MR. WIRSHBA: Thank you, your Honor.		
9		* * *		
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				